

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 10, 2006. By this response, claims 1, 3, 19, 20, 25, 33, 39, 40, 41 and 60 are amended to improve wording. No new matter is introduced. Claims 1-60 are now active for examination.

**The Office Action**

The non-final Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14, 25-34, 36-42, 49-53 and 55-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ooki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,518). The Office Action rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,596) in view of Imai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,467). Claims 2, 13, 15-20 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. in view of Dustan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,312). The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. and Dustan et al., and further in view of Sprecher (U.S. Patent No. 5,285,494). Claims 7, 46-48 and 54 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. in view of Dauerer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,627,967). The rejections are respectfully overcome in view of a telephone interview conducted on June 22, 2006, and the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

**The Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy for granting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on June 22, 2006, 2005. During the telephone interview, differences between the claims and the documents of record were discussed.

(1) The rejections based on Ooki are overcome

In the Interview, the Examiner acknowledged that the documents of record, either combined or alone, do not teach or suggest storing data specifying entitlements of each of a plurality of users to access a plurality of preset functions of a software application, and granting each user access to the plurality of the preset functions of the software application according to the entitlements stored the memory. Per the Examiner's suggestions, the claims are amended to improve wording and further clarify the differences between the claims and the cited documents. Appropriate support for the amendment can be found in, for example, Fig. 6 and page 15, last paragraph through page 16, first paragraph of the written description.

On the other hand, Ooki describes using a privilege table to identify privileges of users to access data. In other words, the privilege table is related to a single function of the software application, i.e., the function of accessing data. Unlike the features described in the claims, Ooki does not store data specifying entitlements of a user to access a plurality of preset functions of a software application. It is believed that other documents of record also fail to teach this feature. Therefore, Ooki, either alone or combined with other cited documents, does not disclose every limitation of the claims. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over Ooki and/or the combinations of Ooki and other documents of record.

(2) Claim 60 is patentable

Furthermore, during the interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that, according to an agreement reached in an interview on November 29, 2005, claim 60 is patentable over the documents of record. Specifically, it was agreed that the documents of record do not teach or suggest features related to granting a user access to a function of a software application based on the role of the user or a function to be performed by the user, as described in claim 60. However,

the Office Action maintained the rejection of claim 60 from the previous office action. In the interview on June 22, 2006, the Examiner acknowledged that the rejection of claim 60 was an oversight, and suggested Applicants pointing out the deficiency in this Response, and providing information identifying supporting descriptions in the specification.

Per the Examiner's request, it is respectfully submitted that appropriate support for the features described in claim 60 can be found in, for instance, page 20, first paragraph of the specification. For example, according to an embodiment described in the specification, through the use of ASDS 102, a manager at client 112 and 114 can create a job role that explicitly defines the scope of responsibilities for client employees. Once this role is defined, an administrator can attach one or more application functions to the role. Employees of the client 112 and 114 who are assigned this job role will automatically be granted access to the applications and functionality defined under this role. Thus, the security determinations and decisions do not need to be repeated for every new employee that arrives, or every employee job change, at a client 112 and 114. An unlimited number of users can be assigned to one role, and an unlimited number of applications and functions can be entitled to one role. Since a role is associated with a specific client, it can be controlled independently without affecting other clients.

**The Obviousness Rejection based on Rosenow and Imai Is Overcome**

Claims 1-50 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenow in view of Imai. By this Response, independent claims 1, 25 and 41 are amended. As agreed upon during the interview, the obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed because the cited documents cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Rosenow pertains to a system that utilizes encrypted communications when authorizing a

user computer to access protected data. Though a privilege level of a user is determined before an authorization is granted, the authorization in Rosenow was for authorizing a user to use a single function of the software application, i.e., the function of accessing data. Rosenow does not teach or suggest storing data related to privileges of users in accessing a plurality of preset functions of a software application, as described in claim 1. The other cited patent, Imai, describes a registration table to register each program's privilege to access copyrighted materials. See Fig. 23 and col. 23, ln. 54 through col. 24, ln. 29 of Imai. Noticeably, the registration table described in Imai specifies privilege levels associated with a program, not a user, as described in claim 1. Moreover, like the deficiency of Rosenow and Ooki, Imai's system only describes restricting access to copyrighted materials, and does not specifically teach accessing a plurality of preset functions of a software application based on information related to the user's entitlements, as described in claim 1.

Accordingly, Rosenow and Imai, even if combined, still fail to disclose the feature of controlling access to functions of application software, as described in claim 1. Hence, Rosenow and Imai cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Obviousness rejection of claim 1 is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-50 either incorporate every limitation of claim 1 based on their dependencies, or include limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1 regarding entitlements of a user to access a plurality of preset functions of a software application. Consequently, claims 2-50 also are patentable over Rosenow and Imai for at least the same reasons as for claim 1, as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2-50 is respectfully requested.

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. However, if the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to **Deposit Account 500417** and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen  
Registration No. 56,665

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: July 10, 2006**  
WDC99 1212555-1.067389.0023

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**